A U M

Talent is nurtured in solitude, but Character 'mid the tempests of the world.—GOETHE

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XLIV October, 1956 No. 12

SOURCES OF COURAGE

ONLY to contemplate the world as we know it, with its foreshortened horizons of hope, its heavy weight of threatening phantasms from the past, is to bring into the wings of the mind those familiar epithets, "anxiety" and "frustration" which so aptly characterize great masses of people everywhere. These feelings are the brakes upon sympathy, the blinders to mutual understanding, and they have their origin, not in wickedness, although they often lead to wickedness, but in ignorance and fear.

It is ignorance which darkens our surroundings, bringing uncertainty, and the fears which result tie knots in the heart. We have need of recognizing this, lest the evil that men do be thought to represent a love of evil for itself, and so blight our comprehension of mankind. A pitiable loneliness and longing to be loved may lie at the root of a chain of action which, at its end, strikes horror to the heart. The wild hopes which are the illegitimate children of terror sometimes bring madly impulsive deeds—deeds which cannot be undone—and so whole lives are lived out in degradation and the personal disaster we call a life of "crime."

But it was fear, not love of evil, which began the dread cycle. It was the despair which comes from the threat of life and love denied that brought all this mindless ruin. There is, alas, so little courage, so little faith and patience in the world.

In *Seed Beneath the Snow,* Ignazio Silone wrote of the tragedy of an entire countryside, in which the people had lost faith in one another. These people, so long betrayed, even by their friends, had lost the capacity to trust. They were not members of a human community any more, but isolated citadels of suspicion. Words, to them, were

meaningless. And so Silone makes his hero, Spina, perform acts of simple kindness. Spina had been writing pamphlets and tracts to bring help to those people—writing them for years—but now he understood that his efforts had been wasted. They did not, could not, understand. The currency of communication with ideas had been so debased that words would no longer serve his purpose. Thus Spina replaced his words with acts of love. With this recognition and beginning of a new course, Silone ends his book. There was, indeed, no more to say.

A like disaster afflicts the world in the more general terms of anxiety and frustration. How can speech or wise counsels affect the distraught, the suspicious, and the terrified? For these, the subtler discourse of action, or of feelings in the heart, is needed. Courage is a leaven which convinces without argument. Simply to be in the presence of a courageous man has a tranquilizing effect.

It may be thought that the injunction to become courageous in response to the deep need of others is an unpsychological demand. Who, when having courage is so difficult, will react to such appeal? But is there any more compelling reason for courage than love? The mother who sees her child in danger loses all care for her own safety. The timid father may momentarily grow into a man of dignity and determination in the face of threat to his family. To have courage in behalf of other units of life is to have the strength of those others—to be, that is, on the side of their life.

In the case of lovers of Theosophy, the appeal is more abstract, although, in compensation, the resources are greater by far. Something of the needed attitude toward oneself is conveyed by *Light on the Path*:

> The whole nature of man must be used wisely by the one who desires to enter the way. Each man is to himself absolutely the way, the truth, and the life. But he is only so when he grasps his whole individuality as not himself, but that thing which he has with pain created for his own use, and by means of which he purposes, as his growth slowly develops his intelligence, to reach to the life beyond individuality [personality]. When he knows that for this his wonderful complex separated life exists, then, indeed, and then only, is he upon the way.

Courage comes from two sources. It comes from allies, and it comes from a sure sense of spiritual identity. The courage from allies comes first.

The teaching of the elementals has a bearing, here, since it relates to the sense of harmonious being felt by the individual. When, in the

Voice of the Silence, all Nature resounds with the splendor of the achievement recorded at the end of the Third Fragment, there is a sense in which the whole of natural creation has become the ally of the triumphant disciple. He is no more an individual alone, but the awakened center of the entire constellation of life, the natural world having become, through his understanding, the organ of his larger being.

So in the first steps, also, there is a conscious beginning to the making of natural allies. A brave man, coming into the presence of frightened people, brings an aura of calm to the gathering. He brings, that is, a kind of friendship with life, in which others may vicariously participate. He is a sphere of influence as well as a person.

The practice of courage begins in small things. Honesty has a major role in the development of courage, since the desire to deceive is in many cases only the desire to shield oneself, and not to hurt another. People lie to hide themselves as they think they are, to give the impression that they are as they think they *ought* to be. This is a left-handed tribute to moral aspiration, but reveals a lack of self-knowledge. The unhappy result to the deceiver is that he begins to carry about with him an air of equivocation, and this is weakness. The Karma of equivocation is the web of uncertainty which produces ambivalence and shackles the will. It is in this sense, perhaps, that "conscience doth make cowards of us all."

To want to be what we are not, or to want to appear what we are not —these are evidences that we do not know what we are, or we should not long to be something else. We are truly enough; only thinking we are not disarms us.

Courage, then, is the manifest of reconciliation with ourselves, and with life. We start with reconciliation with ourselves, then beginning the long task of reconciliation with life. Every injustice, every partisan feeling, increases the heavy debt we owe, diminishing our store of courage. Each act of integrity, each resistance to the impulse to pretend, increases it. Finally, we must begin to feel the stir of life which moves *with* us, and this is the strength of our allies.

But courage of this sort is possible for the selfish man as well as the disciple. His courage grows from a circle of connections which is limited, but it grows, and may expand even to the limit of his orbit. So run the similitudes of good and evil action, the uniformities of law which know nothing of morality. The pain of the good man, when matched with forces greater than his own, is hard to bear. But here, too,

Karma is working out. The world is filled with instances of defeat to men with good in their hearts, of innocence dragged in the mire, of broken hearts.

There is only one sort of courage which can thwart the desperation of injustice, and that is the courage arising from an ineradicable sense of Self. The allies of the good man—allies of men, of his own past, of the psychic hierarchies of elemental association—are instances of the Self, but they are not the Self. "Hold fast," we are told, "to that which has neither substance nor existence." Here, incredibly to the intellect, is found a courage which grows from the heart of life—which takes its strength from neither good nor evil, and is diminished by neither. "It is written that for him who is on the threshold of divinity, no law can be framed, no guide can exist." The man who can contemplate that time of trial without fear has gained a courage beyond all the powers of heaven or earth.

But however distant that hour of supreme self-realization, its harbinger has momentary presence in each separate act of decision. The life of the would-be occultist, however humble, lies in endeavoring to see the universal duty in each particular. And courage, after all, would not exist at all save for the effort to act in the half-light of what knowledge we have, and in being ready to accept the consequences. By this means we gain allies which will support us without the grip of attachment. By this means, our loves, while none the less deep, become free.

There is also a confidence which springs from the study of philosophy. Philosophy teaches us that all actions are relative, that all mistakes have an end. It teaches us that we cannot perform an act that will lead to *absolute* disaster, and that the only real failure is the attempt to withdraw from any act of life.

Study, therefore, is a strengthener of the will. By a kind of osmosis between the mind and the feelings, the thought of universal processes of life slowly informs the psychic nature, lessening its tendency to wild oscillation and irrational response to difficulty. Control appears, first possible, then desirable, in the light of knowledge of the processes of life. And with control comes dispassion, and then, as naturally as any dawning, courage.

These, surely, are the means by which a tranquility of life will be brought to the world. And there are endless places to begin the labors that lead toward the peace that is hungered for in the hearts of all.

THINGS COMMON TO CHRISTIANITY AND THEOSOPHY

THAT the Theosophical Society is not opposed to Christianity in either its dogmatic or pure form is easily demonstrated. Our constitution forbids it and the second object of the Society does also. The laws of our body say that there shall be no crusade against any religion, tacitly excepting, of course, the few degraded and bestial religions now in the world; the second object provides for a full and free study of all religions without bias and without hatred or sectarianism. And our history also, offering to view branch societies all over the world composed of Christians, refutes the charge that the Society as such is opposed to Christianity. One instance is enough, that of the well-known Scottish Lodge, which states in its printed Transactions No. IX, "Theosophists who are Christians (and such are the majority of the Scottish Lodge). . . . Therefore Christians who are sincere and who know what Theosophy means must be Theosophists. . . ." If members of the Society have said to the contrary it has been from ignorance and a careless thinking, for on the same ground we should also be opposed to all other religions which have any forms, and both Brahmanism and Buddhism have as much of formalism as has Christianity. Generally speaking, then, the Society is not and cannot be opposed to Christianity, while it may lead to a denial of some of the men-made theories of that Church.

But that is no more than branches of Christianity have always been doing, nor is it as much a danger to formal Christianity as the new standards of criticism which have crept into the Church.

Nor can it be either that Theosophy as a whole is opposed to Christianity, inasmuch as Theosophy is and must be the one truth underlying all religions that have ever been among men. A calm and sincere examination of all the world's religions reveals the fact that in respect to ethics, in respect to laws, in respect to precepts or example or effect on daily life, or even in respect to cosmogony and cosmology, the other religious books of the world are the same in most respects as those of the Christians, and that the distinguishing difference between the latter's religion and the others is that it asserts an exclusiveness for itself and a species of doctrinal intolerance not found in the rest.

NOTE.—This article, an address before the Aryan Theosophical Society, by William Q. Judge, N. Y., Jan 9, 1894, was originally reprinted in THEOSOPHY 9:54, 90 from a pamphlet of similar title published in that year. The article is complete in this issue.

If we take the words and the example of Jesus as the founder of Christianity, it is at once seen that there is no opposition at all between that form of religion and Theosophy. Indeed, there is the completest agreement. New ethics are not brought forward by Theosophy, nor can they be, as ethics of the right sort must always be the same. In his sermons and sayings are to be found the ethics given out by Buddha and by all other great teachers of all time. These cannot be altered, even though they hold up to weak mortals an ideal that is very difficult to live up to and sometimes impossible to realize in daily life. That these rules of conduct laid down by Jesus are admittedly hard to follow is shown in the behavior of Christian states toward each other and in the declarations of their high prelates that the religion of Jesus cannot be the basis for diplomatic relations nor for the state government. Hence we find that the refuge from all this adopted by the theologian is in the statement that, although other and older religions had moral truth and similar ethics to those of Jesus, the Christian religion is the only one wherein the founder asserted that he was not merely a teacher from God, but was also at the same time God himself; that is, that prior to Jesus a great deal of good was taught, but God did not see fit until the time of Jesus to come down among men into incarnation. Necessarily such a declaration would seem to have the effect of breeding intolerance from the high and exclusive nature of the claim made. But an examination of Brahmanism shows that Rama was also God incarnate among men, though there the doctrine did not arouse the same sum of intolerance among its believers. So it must be true that it is not always a necessary consequence of such a belief that aggressive and exclusive intolerance will grow up.

The beliefs and teachings of Christianity are not all supportable by the words of Jesus, but his doctrines are at all times in accord with Theosophy. There is certainly a wide difference between the command of Jesus to be poor and to have neither staff nor money and the fact of the possession by the Church of vast sums of money and immense masses of property, and with the drawing of high salaries by prelates, and with the sitting of prelates among the rulers of the earth upon thrones, and in the going to war and the levying of taxes by the Pope and by other religious heads. The gathering of tithes and enforcement of them by law and by imprisonment at the instance of the Protestant clergy are not at all consistent with the words of Jesus. But all of the foregoing inconsistent matters are a part of present Christianity, and

if in those respects a difference from or opposition to them should seem to arise from Theosophical teachings we must admit it, but cannot be blamed. If we go back to the times of the early Christians and compare that Christianity with the present form, we see that opposition by Theosophy could hardly be charged, but that the real opposition then would be between that early form of the religion and its present complexion. It has been altered so much that the two are scarcely recognizable as the same. This is so much so that there exists a Christian sect to-day called "Early Christian."

Every one has at all times a right to object to theological interpretations if they are wrong, or if they distort the original teaching or introduce new notions. In this respect there is a criticism by Theosophy and Theosophists. But thinkers in the world not members of this Society and not leaning to Theosophy do the same thing. Huxley and Tyndall and Darwin and hosts of others took ground that by mere force of truth and fact went against theological views. Galileo also, seeing that the earth was round and moved, said so, but the theologian, thinking that such belief tended to destroy the power of the church and to upset biblical theories, made him recant at the risk of his liberty and life. If the old views of theology were still in force with the state behind them, the triumphs of science would have been few and we might still be imagining the earth flat and square and the sun revolving about it.

Theosophical investigation discloses to the student's view the fact that in all ages there have appeared great teachers of religion and that they all had two methods of instruction. One, or that for the masses of people, was plain and easy to undersand; it was of ethics, of this life and of the next, of immortality and love; it always gave out the Golden Rule. Such a teacher was Buddha, and there can be no controversy on the fact that he died centuries before the birth of Jesus. He declared his religion to be that of love. Others did the same. Jesus came and taught ethics and love, with the prominent exception of his prophecy that he came to bring a sword and division as recorded in the Gospels. There is also an incident which accents a great difference between him and Buddha; it is the feast where he drank wine and also made some for others to drink. In regard to this matter, Buddha always taught that all intoxicating liquors were to be rigidly abstained from. The second method was the secret or Esoteric one, and that Jesus also used. We find his disciples asking him why he always used easy parables with the people, and he replied that to the disciples he taught the mys-

teries, or the more recondite matters of religion. This is the same as prevailed with the older saints. Buddha also had his private teachings to certain disciples. He even made a distinction among his personal followers, making classes in their ranks, to one of which he gave the simple rules, to the other the complex and difficult. So he must have pursued the ancient practise of having two sets of teachings, and this must have been a consequence of his education.

At twelve years of age he came to the temple and disputed with the learned rabbis on matters of the law. Thus he must have known the law; and what that law was and is, it is necessary to ask. It was the law of Moses, full of the most technical and abstruse things, and not all to be found in the simple words of the books. The Hebrew books are a vast mine of cypher designedly so constructed, and that should be borne in mind by all students. It ought to be known to Christians, but is not, as they prefer not to go into the mysteries of the Jews. But Jesus knew it. His remark that "not one jot or tittle of the law would pass" shows this. Most people read this simply as rhetoric, but it is not so. The jots and tittles are a part of the books and go to make up the cypher of the Cabala or the hidden meaning of the law. This is a vast system of itself, and was not invented after the time of Jesus. Each letter is also a number, and thus every word can be and is, according to a well-known rule, turned into some other word or into a number. Thus one name will be a part of a supposed historical story, but when read by the cypher it becomes a number of some cycle or event or a sign of the Zodiac or something else quite different from the mere letters. Thus the name of Adam is composed of three consonants. A, D, and M. These mean by the system of the cypher respectively "Adam, David, and Messiah." The Jews also held that Adam for his first sin would have to and did reincarnate as David and would later come as Messiah. Turning to Revelations we find traces of the same system in the remarks about the numbers of the beast and the man. The Cabala or hidden law is of the highest importance, and as the Christian religion is a Hebraic one it cannot be properly studied or understood without the aid given by the secret teaching. And the Cabala is not dead or unknown, but has many treatises written on it in different languages. By using it, we will find in the Old Testament and in the records of Jesus a complete and singular agreement with Theosophy.

Examine, for instance, the Theosophical teachings that there is a secret or esoteric doctrine, and the doctrine of inability of man to com-

prehend God. This is the Brahmanical doctrine of the unapproachableness of Parabrahm. In Exodus there is a story which to the profane is absurd, of God telling Moses that he could not see him. It is in Exodus, xxxiii; 20, where God says Moses could see him from behind only. Treat this by the rule of the Cabala and it is plain, but read it on the surface and you have nonsense. In Exodus iii, 14, God says that his name is "I am that I am." This is AHYH ASHR AHYH, which has to be turned into its numerical value, as each letter is also a number. Thus A is 1, H is 5, Y is 10, H is 5. There being two words the same, they add up 42. The second word is A, 1; SH, 300; R, 200; making 501, which added to 42 gives 543 as the number of "I am that I am." Now Moses by the same system makes 345 or the reverse of the other, by which the Cabala shows God meant Moses to know God by his reverse or Moses himself. To some this may appear fanciful, but as it is the method on which these old books are constructed it must be known in order to understand what is not clear and to remove from the Christian books the well-sustained charge of absurdity and sometimes injustice and cruelty shown on their face. So instead of God's being made ridiculous by attributing to him such a remark as that Moses could only "see his hinder parts," we perceive that under the words is a deep philosophical tenet corresponding to that of Theosophy, that Parabrahm is not to be known and that Man is a small copy of God through which in some sense or in the reverse we may see God.

For the purposes of this discussion along the line of comparison we will have to place Christianity on one side and put on the other as representing the whole body of Theosophy, so far as revealed, the other various religions of the world, and see what, if anything, is common between them. First we see that Christianity, being the younger, has borrowed its doctrines from other religions. It is now too enlightened an age to say, as the Church did when Abbé Huc brought his account of Buddhism from Tibet, that either the devil or wicked men invented the old religions so as to confuse and confute the Christian. Evidently, no matter how done, the system of the Christian is mixed Aryan and Jewish. This could not be otherwise, since Jesus was a Jew, and his best disciples and the others who came after like Paul were of the same race and faith. The early Fathers also, living as they did in Eastern lands, got their ideas from what they found about them.

Next a very slight examination will disclose that fact that the ritual of the Christian Church is also borrowed. Taken from all nations and

religions, not one part of it is either of this age or of the Western Hemisphere. The Brahmans have an extensive and elaborate ritual, and so have the Buddhists. The rosary, long supposed by Catholics to be a thing of their own, has existed in Japan for uncounted years, and much before the West had any civilization the Brahman had his form of rosary. The Roman Catholic Christian sees the priest ring the bell at a certain part of the Mass, and the old Brahman knows that when he is praying to God he must also ring a bell to be found in every house as well as in the temple. This is very like what Jesus commanded. He said that prayer must be in secret, that is, where no one can hear; the Brahman rings the small bell so that even if ears be near they shall not hear any words but only the sound of the bell. The Christian has images of virgin and child; the same thing is to be found in Egyptian papyri and in carved statues in India made before the Christian came into existence. Indeed, all the ritual and observance of the Christian churches may be found in the mass of other religions with which for the moment we are making a rough comparison.

Turning now to doctrine, we find again complete agreement with the dogmatic part of Christianity in these older religions. Salvation by faith is taught by some priests. That is an old Brahmanical theory, but with the difference that the Brahman one calls for faith in God as the means, the end, and the object of faith. The Christian adds faith in the son of God. A form of Japanese Buddhism said to be due to Amitabha says that one may be saved by complete faith in Amita Buddha, and that even if one prays but three times to Amita he will be saved in accordance with a vow made by that teacher. Immortality of soul has ever been taught by the Brahmans. Their whole system of religion and of cosmogony is founded on the idea of soul and of spiritual nature of the universe. Jesus and St. Paul taught the unity of spiritual beings—or men—when they said that heaven and the spirit of God were in us, and the doctrine of Unity is one of the oldest and most important of the Brahmanical scheme. The possibility of arriving at perfection by means of religion and science combined so that a man becomes godlike—or the doctrine of Adepts and Mahatmas as found in Theosophy—is common to Buddhism and Brahmanism, and is not contrary to the teachings of Jesus. He said to his disciples that they could if they would do even greater works—or "miracles"—than he did. To do these works one has to have great knowledge and power. The doctrine assumes the perfectability of humanity and destroys the

theory of original sin; but far from being out of concordance with the religion of Jesus, it is in perfect accord. He directed his followers to be perfect even as the Father in heaven is. They could not come up to that command by any possibility unless man has the power to reach to that high state. The command is the same as is found in the ancient Aryan system. Hence, then, whether we look broadly over the field at mere ritual dogma or at ethics, we find the most complete accord between Theosophy and true Christianity.

But now taking up some important doctrines put forward by members of the Theosophical Society under their right of free investigation and free speech, what do we discover? Novelty, it is true, to the mind of the Western man half-taught about his own religion, but nothing that is uncommon to Christianity. Those doctrines may be for the present, such as Reincarnation or rebirth over and over again for the purpose of discipline and gain, for reward, for punishment, and for enlargement of character; next Karma, or exact justice or compensation for all thoughts and acts. These two are a part of Christianity, and may be found in the Bible.

Reincarnation has been regarded by some Christian ministers as essential to the Christian religion. Dr. Edward Beecher said he saw its necessity, and the Rev. Wm. Alger has recorded his view to the same effect. If a Christian insists upon belief in Jesus, who came only eighteen centuries ago after milleniums had passed and men had died out of the faith by millions, it will be unjust for them to be condemned for a failure to believe a doctrine they never heard of; hence the Christian may well say that under the law of reincarnation, which was upheld by Jesus, all those who never heard of Jesus will be reborn after his coming in A.D. 1, so as to accept the plan of salvation.

In the Gospels we find Jesus referring to this doctrine as if a well established one. When it was broached by the disciples as the possible reason for the punishment by blindness from birth of a man of the time, Jesus did not controvert the doctrine, as he would have done did he see in his wisdom as Son of God that it was pernicious. But at another time he asserted that John the Baptist was the reincarnation of Elias the ancient prophet. This cannot be wiped out of the books, and is a doctrine as firmly fixed in Christianity, though just now out of favor, as is any other. The paper by Prof. Landsberg shows you what Origen, one of the greatest of the Christian Fathers, taught on preëxistence of souls. This theory naturally suggests reincarnation on this earth, for it

is more natural to suppose the soul's wanderings to be here until all that life can give has been gained, rather than that the soul should wander among other planets or simply fall to this abruptly, to be as suddenly raised up to heaven or thrown down to hell.

The next great doctrine is Karma. This is the religion of salvation by works as opposed to faith devoid of works. It is one of the prime doctrines of Jesus. By "by their works ye shall know them," he must have meant that faith without works is dead. The meaning of *Karma* literally is "works," and the Hindus apply it not only to the operations of nature and of the great laws of nature in connection with man's reward and punishment, but also to all the different works that man can perform. St. James insists on the religion of works. He says that true religion is to visit the fatherless and the widows and to keep oneself unspotted from the world. St. Matthew says we shall be judged for every act, word, and thought. This alone is possible under the doctrine of Karma. The command of Jesus to refrain from judgment or we should ourselves be judged is a plain statement of Karma, as is, too, the rest of the verse saying that what we mete out shall be given back to us. St. Paul, following this, distinctly states the doctrine thus: "Brethren, be not deceived; God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that also shall he reap." The word "whatsoever" includes every act and thought, and permits no escape from the consequences of any act. A clearer statement of the law of Karma as applied to daily life could hardly be made. Again, going to Revelations, the last words in the Christian book, we read all through it that the last judgment proceeds on the work—in other words, on the Karma—of men. It distinctly asserts that in the vision, as well as in the messages to the Churches, judgment passes for works.

We therefore must conclude that the religion of Jesus is in complete accord with the chief doctrines of Theosophy; it is fair to assume that even the most recondite of theosophical theories would not have been opposed by him. Our discussion must have led us to the conclusion that the religion of Karma, the practise of good works, is that in which the religion of Jesus agrees with Theosophy, and that alone thereby will arrive the longed-for day when the great ideal of Universal Brotherhood will be realized, and will furnish the common ground on which all faiths may stand and from which every nation may work for the good and the perfection of the human family.

NOTES ON THE DHAMMAPADA

CANTO Eleven of the *Dhammapada* comprises one of the sternest phases of Buddha's instruction—insistence that the disciple fully comprehend the weakness and corruptibility of the physical flesh. The first five verses are all variations of a theme suggested by Buddha's question, "What pleasure is there in looking at these bleached bones, like gourds cast away in the autumn?" The body, viewed simply from the physical standpoint is "stuck together, sickly, frail, a nest of diseases." And here the casual reader may feel that there is justification for the long-popular Occidental conclusion that Buddha was interested only in release from physical existence. However, verse six provides a balance:

> The splendid chariots of kings wear away; the body also comes to old age; but the virtue of the good never ages. Thus the saintly teach each other.

If the "virtue of the good never ages," this suggests that Buddha's emphasis on the corruptibility of the flesh is but a way of supporting his opposite emphasis upon the Real, the Eternal. This method of instruction must be comprehended if Buddha's psychological approach is to be understood. Repetition of the obvious and the common sets the stage for highlighting the uncommon—just as we find, in daily life, a few transcendent glimpses of spiritual reality standing like beacon lights against the litter of purely psychic impressions. Buddha is not trying to suggest an escape from the flesh, but escape from *bondage* to it. It is the unbalanced obsession with the preservation of the body which he seeks to uproot. When he asks, "Why this laughter, why this jubilation?" in respect to sensual existence, he is also implying that there is a place for laughter and jubilation—but that this place is never clear to us until we have broken through self-deceit.

The place of joy and serenity in Buddhist philosophy is expressed in a popular Chinese description of "The Buddha-field," the title being "The Pure Land of Amitabha." When one has attained the "Buddha-field," he discovers that it is truly "delightful." Broad rivers of happiness run through "the Buddha-field." In the translation of "The Pure Land of Amitabha" selected by E. A. Burtt in his *Teachings of The Compassionate Buddha,* the description continues:

> And as to the pleasant sound which issues from the water (of these rivers), that reaches all the parts of this Buddha-field. And everyone hears the pleasant sound he wishes to hear, i.e., he hears of the Buddha, the Dharma, the Sangha, of the (six) perfections, the (ten) stages, the powers, the grounds of self-confidence, of the special dharmas of a Buddha, of the forms of analytic knowledge, of emptiness, the signless, and the wishless, of the uneffected, the unborn, of non-production, non-existence, non-cessation, of calm, quietude and peace, of the great friendliness, the great campassion, the great sympathetic joy, the great evenmindedness, of the patient acceptance of things which fail to be produced, and of the acquisition of the stage where one is consecrated (as a Tathagata). And, hearing this, one gains the exalted zest and joyfulness which is associated with detachment, dispassion, calm, cessation, Dharma, and brings about the state of mind which leads to the accomplishment of enlightenment.

These passages show the subtlety of the æsthetic attitude in the Buddhist perspective. A book review by Louis Renou in the philosophical quarterly, *Diogenes* (Winter, 1955), notices that the "emphatic repetition" in Buddhist scripture is like the underlying musical beat which sustains a powerful melody. The "beat" insists upon the undependability of the senses, at the same time lending form to the melody. Both the Buddhist canons and the great epic poems of India share this repetitive technique. Mr. Renou writes:

> We find whole sections in the Buddhist canon, notably in the sermons, reproduced in one text after another in identical terms, as parallel developments echoing each other. We also find formulas of varying length which form the unvarying ground of a description. Above this monotonous base the slightest variation or singularity in a dialogue immediately stands out. There was doubtless the intention of creating an atmosphere, a décor; it also provided mnemonic exercise. This training which in our civilizations, where memory plays such a small role, is performed by directing attention to the new, the diverse, is acquired in the Orient by means of repetition.
>
> The quasi-magical element in repetition, finally, satisfies a basic exigency of the sacred. The very intensity sought by profane art in the discontinuous, the surprise, the march toward a climax, is obtained in religious art by the incessant repeat, the particular resonance of the same motifs; thus it is related to the melodic lines which music retained much longer and more faithfully than did literary art.

Some abridged translations of the *Dhammapada* appear without canto eleven, presumably because it seems so negative. Yet it is from these verses that some of Edwin Arnold's most beautiful passages are

derived—and derived directly from the text. A Buddhist Society rendition of chapter eleven reads:

> Through a round of countless births have I passed fruitlessly in search of the maker of this tabernacle—and painful is the round of births. But now, O Builder of the Tabernacle, I have seen thee; never again shalt thou build me a house. All the rafters are broken and the ridge-pole is broken asunder; and the mind at rest in Nibbana has passed beyond grasping desires.

It was neither difficult, nor was it a distortion, for Arnold to render this passage as follows:

> Many a House of life
> Hath held me—seeking ever him who wrought
> These prisons of the senses, sorrow-fraught;
> Sore was my ceaseless strife!
>
> But now,
> Thou Builder of this Tabernacle—Thou!
> I know Thee! Never shalt Thou build again
> These walls of pain,
> Nor raise the roof-tree of deceits, nor lay
> Fresh rafters on the clay;
> Broken Thy House is, and the ridge-pole split!
> Delusion fashioned it!
> Safe pass I hence—deliverance to obtain.

The basic question, of course, is still that of the nature of "deliverance." In the earlier canto on "Old Age," it is made clear that knowledge and deliverance are to be considered as inseparable, just as are joyfulness and serenity. Buddha's warnings about the impermanence of the flesh and of all fleshly desires is a warning given in kindness; his disciples are helped to realize that in "Old Age" the only rewarding task is the gathering of "soul wealth." If this task is not undertaken, they will eventually "lie like worn-out bows, sighing after the past."

"Deliverance," in our time, is increasingly defined as "psychological maturity," and the various uses of this phrase strongly suggest Buddha's basic point of view. "All that we are is the result of what we have thought," begins the first verse of the *Dhammapada,* and this is the simplest and clearest manner of saying that men "suffer from themselves—none else compels." Immaturity, inadequate grasp of the basic Laws of Life, will lead to the suffering from which men pray for deliverance. But deliverance is possible only through the agency of the

self-directed will, aimed at overcoming what Patanjali calls "misconceptions of duties and responsibilities."

A passage from Harry Overstreet's *The Mature Mind* provides a modern Western version of Buddhist "deliverance":

> A human being does not grow beyond a problem that has deep emotional significance for him until he comes to terms with that problem: until he understands it; accommodates it in his life arrangements; if possible, resolves it entirely. Instead of growing beyond such an unresolved problem—and of growing beyond its power to hurt—the individual becomes fixated at the point of development where he encountered the problem. A neurosis in adulthood is a sign that at some certain point in the formative years of life development was thus arrested. A shock experience that should properly have been assimilated and outlived was, instead, repressed into the unconscious, where it continued to operate in its infantile form. The adult, in brief, is neurotic because he is continuing to seek in infantile ways a solution to a problem that overpowered him in infancy. Thus, a neurosis is an ungrown-up way of trying to solve a conflict that can only be solved, by the adult, in a grown-up way.

A Key to Buddhism

Buddhism, I feel sure, is a religion of important affirmation. Doubtless many Buddhists, themselves, do not know quite what they mean by illusion, but I think the Buddhist sages have known. I think that to these sages Maya has not meant the illusion of perception but the false conclusions which we base upon perception—the superstitions of permanency we develop about impermanent things, the illusion of immutability that we have about changing things, the illusion of possession we develop about things we use.

—Edmond Taylor

BASIC PRINCIPLES OF THEOSOPHY

IT would be natural enough, perhaps, to suppose that a subject such as Basic Principles of Theosophy—or "basic principles" of anything else—would be a subject easy to present and easy to comprehend. But this is far from the case when one tries to consider the total meaning of the history of theosophic thought, and the totality of the writings of Madame H. P. Blavatsky. The following collation, taken from several portions of H. P. B.'s writings, indicates the dual nature of Theosophy and the interrelationship of *attitude* and *doctrine.* In other words, her development of Theosophy as a *system of thought* is meant to have an appropriate preface:

> Theosophy allows a hearing and a fair chance to all. It deems no views—if sincere—entirely destitute of truth. It respects thinking men, to whatever class of thought they may belong. Indeed, the conclusions or deductions of a philosophic writer may be entirely opposed to our views and the teachings we expound; yet, his premises and statements of facts may be quite correct, and other people may profit by the adverse philosophy, even if we ourselves reject it, believing we have something higher and still nearer to the truth. Every *true* fact, every sincere word are thus part and parcel of Theosophy. One who is even approximately blessed with the gift of the perception of truth, will find and extract it from an erroneous as much as from a correct statement. However small the particle of gold lost in a ton of rubbish, it is the noble metal still, and worthy of being dug out even at the price of some extra trouble.
>
> The fundamental teaching of Theosophy is that mankind is essentially of one and the same essence, and that essence is one—infinite, uncreate, and eternal, whether we call it God or Nature—nothing, therefore, can affect one nation or one man without affecting all other nations and all other men. With this object in view, it is the duty of all Theosophists to promote in every practical way, and in all countries, the spread of *non-sectarian education.* What is also needed is to impress men with the idea that, if the root of mankind is *one,* then there must also be one truth which finds expression in all the various religions.
>
> Our Deity is the eternal, incessantly *evolving,* not *creating,* builder of the universe; that *universe itself unfolding* out of its own essence not being *made.* It is the one law, giving the impulse to manifested, eternal, and immutable laws, within that never-manifesting, *because* absolute LAW, which in its manifesting periods is *The ever-Becoming.*

> Moreover, the Secret Doctrine teaches: The fundamental identity of all Souls with the Universal Over-Soul, and the obligatory pilgrimage for every Soul through the Cycle of Incarnation. In other words, no Soul can have an independent (conscious) existence before the spark which issued from the Over-Soul has (a) passed through every elemental form of the phenomenal world, and (b) acquired individuality, first by natural impulse, and then by self-induced and self-devised efforts. The pivotal doctrine of the Esoteric philosophy admits no privileges or special gifts in man, save those won by his own Ego through personal effort and merit throughout a long series of metempsychoses and reincarnations.

The last two paragraphs outline Theosophy as a philosophical construct. But Madame Blavatsky's writings also repeatedly turn to the prefatory emphases; she points out that Theosophy is much more than a matter of doctrine or particular precepts or propositions; it is also a matter of the fundamental *attitude* of truth-seeking on the part of the one who becomes a theosophical student. It is therefore necessary to consider Theosophy from two different aspects, in order to gain all the meaning implied by the word. Finally, one may hope to show the relationship between "doctrine" and "attitude."

The first implication of the word Theosophy signifies the capacity in all men to *become* students of divine wisdom; that is, to have direct apprehension of essential reality. This assumption also means that Theosophy is "created" by each man, for himself. Such teachings as he may study, such disciplines as he may undertake, are only *contributory* to whatever sure wisdom he is able to attain. This realization, truly, is one of the "first principles" of Theosophy, and distinguishes Theosophy in all ages from the typical approach of sectarian religion.

The theosophical student must fight for self-knowledge; he must be on an adventure of the mind; he must undergo a discipline of his emotional nature; he must nurture a growth of the soul. He apprehends Theosophy only in so far as he does this, and therefore Theosophy may not be learned as one learns a particular science. Nor can the memorization and repetition of various statements made by a Buddha, a Krishna, an H.P.B., qualify him as a Theosophist in this basic sense. Even a nineteenth century encyclopedia's definition of the word Theosophy took this dimension into account, stressing that Theosophy was presented as a wisdom which must come to each person according to his own powers of revelation; not revelation from on high. Theosophy means "divine wisdom," because the nature of man is therein considered to be so exalted in potentiality that each human

being is actually able to apprehend basic truths. This outlook on the nature of man, this faith in his ultimate capacity to pass beyond the confines of prejudicial creeds, beyond partisanship in philosophy and religion and all things else—this is another "basic principle" of Theosophy. And it *relates* to the first fundamental proposition of H.P.B.'s major work, *The Secret Doctrine.*

Another basic principle of Theosophy is revealed by a study of what has been called the "Theosophical Movement" of ideas throughout history. The word Theosophy apparently comes to us from ancient Egyptian times, but was given specific meaning in the third century of our era by Ammonius Saccas, an Alexandrian philosopher who was more than just another philosopher with a particular emphasis of his own to present. He called his school the "Eclectic Theosophical system"; its members, he called "philaletheians"—lovers of truth. *Truth* was to be honored wherever it was found. So, in the school of Ammonius, the teachings of Zoroaster, of Buddha, and of ancient and modern Greek philosophers, were all studied. The program was built upon the fundamental assumption that each man has a portion, a glimpse, a vision of the truth of his own nature. The idea, then, was to help men to *further* realize the greatness of the human capacity to envision, to philosophize, to learn. Each of the schools of thought which Ammonius brought together represented a particular emphasis, a particular *kind* of illumination concerning the life of the soul.

The disciples of Ammonius were also called "analogists," in recognition of the attempt of Ammonius to focus attention on the related content of all symbolism which has to do with the life and growth of the soul. The Alexandrian theosophists saw everywhere—in the symbolic representations of the past, in drama and poetry and art—a representation of the life of the soul, a poetic expression of the striving of the soul. This second basic principle to which we are calling attention, then, has to do with the *willingness to explore in all directions* for truth; to see truth, not as revealed only in a single formation, but rather as illumined and enlightened by even the partial truths of less exalted thought.

This particular principle of Theosophy was fundamental also to the Theosophical Society of the last century. The second object of the Society amounted to a declaration on the part of its members to devote themselves impartially to a comparative study of ancient and modern religions and philosophies. It was then made clear to all

who became members of the Theosophical Society that no particular set of doctrines was to be regarded as official; that all were entitled to their own beliefs whether they be Moslem, Buddhist, Christian, or even sincere and searching materialists or psychic researchers in the Spiritualist ranks. Members were simply asked (and even this request was implicit) to somehow transform, to evaluate, improve, and revise their beliefs. So while men were never interfered with in their particular faiths, they were invited, by the very fact that there were others around them with different points of emphasis and different backgrounds, to see the need for discovering the "divine" capacity for the sort of wisdom that leads men to see beyond differences, beyond the splits of ideas; to see that two almost contradictory doctrines might, in logic and at one point in history, have been of common origin.

So the Theosophical Society actually demanded more than intellectual study; it required an intellectual *discipline,* but the dream was to awaken a sense of universal brotherhood. If we have sufficient understanding, we cannot despise, fear, or condemn our fellows; we can see in their struggles and tribulations but another chapter in the story of a soul, and this does away with the "moralisms," the condemnations. It also does away with the tendency to go the way of a strict set of commandments, to build a code of morality which governs *actions* and leaves out of account the inner difficulties besetting the *individuals* involved.

This, in other words, is the broad view of one's fellow-man suggested by, and the inevitable result of, the sincere study of different ideas and beliefs. Here again is a *second* "basic principle" of Theosophy that may not be separated from those propositions which Theosophical students are first prone to think of. This is the area out of which apprehension of specific propositions and principles may come; without this attitude, one may become enslaved by even the most exalted doctrine, and think he possesses wisdom, when actually he possesses only the faint reflection of the wisdom of someone else.

The Third Fundamental Proposition of Theosophy as a system of thought was quoted in the last paragraph of our collation. This proposition states, in effect, that when man considers himself as having wondrous powers, he must realize that the soul is transcendent of the body—that the soul is real and lives forever, and that the soul creates for itself its own conditions of reward and punishment through a long cycle of metempsychosis, as it transforms and refines its "char-

acter." Man, therefore, is in a very real sense a "law unto himself." As Buddha says: "Ye suffer from yourselves. None else compels, none other holds you that ye live and die." Those who become great sages, become such, not because they were fortunate in their teachers, not because they were favored by revelation, but because they achieved discipline, and persevered in attaining broader vision. Therefore, on the basis of this Third Proposition of H.P.B.'s *Secret Doctrine,* we begin to see the setting for the idea of a fraternity of great sages or adepts, initiates and Mahatmas, who have inevitably attained a clear apprehension through this long process of evolution. There, again, the fundamental assumption is that the full wisdom of Theosophy is a natural heritage of all mankind.

The Second Proposition of *The Secret Doctrine,* asserting universal periodicity in action, was very briefly stated by Madame Blavatsky, doubtless to inspire reflection. Everything conceivable has something to do with the law of cycles. Beginning with ourselves, we can see the psychological importance of reflecting on periodicity, since it suggests that there is a *reason* why we must come back again and again to the same experience—frequently an unfortunate one. We are drawn through life's experiences by whatever we still need to comprehend. The grasping of experience, distilling from experience, constitutes the purpose of soul. So just as there is an endless cycle of day and night, an endless cycling of the seasons, so for man there is the endless cycle of coming back again and again to those areas of experience where *something* has not yet been thoroughly learned. The symbol of the Eastern doctrine of "release" from bondage to rebirth is a symbol of man's capacity to ultimately transcend the need for being *forced* into any of the experiences in which he presently flounders.

The law of periodicity, then, is the law of learning—an essential of Theosophic teaching of all times. Reincarnation or rebirth of the soul is but an aspect of perceiving that learning is cyclical, as is everything else in nature. Cycles are inevitable, because of an ever-present duality: the co-existence of what we call "spirit" and "matter," the indwelling soul and the outward form. The form is perishable since it is a compound; and since it must disintegrate at the time we call death, it is equally inevitable that there should always be a drawing together of soul and form in co-operation, again constituting a cycle in the re-embodiment of intelligence. This is why reflection upon the universality of periodicity is a profound step in philosophy. It would

appear that in stating the Second Proposition thus simply, Madame Blavatsky deliberately left out a development of these various themes because she wished to stimulate each one in this manner to think, to see what universal laws of learning are involved. So that reincarnation and karma, for instance, are not "doctrines" that Theosophists "believe," but are natural corollaries of a revelation which the student has brought to himself about the fundamental nature of reality: "reality" being dual, that of soul and form, the combination of the two *means* cyclic re-embodiment.

Ammonius Saccas said that each student must pass through three stages as he moves toward the attainment of wisdom. The first stage is that of opinion. Opinion, of course, is based upon our *desire* to believe something, or, perhaps, upon what we have been told to believe. In the second stage the disciple must pass through a natural sequence of initiations. This is the stage of "science," the stage of dialectic, the stage of reason and intellectual discipline. A man must then face his opinions, and realize that they are *only* "opinions," and use his mind to get beyond. This second stage in the theosophical tradition is one wherein a man becomes aware of his reliance upon religion, faith, and belief. We all have such reliance to some degree, but the Theosophist is dedicated to become and remain *aware* of this fact, to see that while it is natural for him to believe, yet his beliefs should never be "blind." The doctrines which he feels *must* represent truth are not ultimate truth, or he would never worry about *asserting* their truthfulness.

The final stage is that of illumination, which comes when the soul-vision is awakened by discipline of the mind. Opinion has then been converted into self-knowledge. When we are willing to *relinquish* our opinions, then we are ready to discover a great deal about ourselves. Illumination carries with it the synthesis, the harvest, of discipline; it is direct cognition.

So, the theosophical student is not engaged in a simple sort of instruction; no *self* instruction is simple, nor are all the "principles of Theosophy" to be easily understood.

THE SYMBOLISM OF NUMBERS

I

THERE is a canon of interpretation which should guide us in our examination of every philosophical opinion: "The human mind has, under the necessary operation of its own laws, been compelled to entertain the same fundamental ideas, and the human heart to cherish the same feelings in all ages." It is certain that Pythagoras awakened the deepest intellectual sympathy of his age, and that his doctrines exerted a powerful influence upon the mind of Plato. His cardinal idea was that there existed a permanent principle of unity beneath the forms, changes, and other phenomena of the universe. Aristotle asserted that he taught that "numbers are the first principles of all entities." Ritter has expressed the opinion that the formula of Pythagoras should be taken symbolically, which is doubtless correct.

The key to the Pythagorean dogmas is the general formula of unity in multiplicity, the one evolving the many and pervading the many. This is the ancient doctrine of emanation in few words. This, as we can see by the following quotation, is purely Hindu and Brahmanical: "When the dissolution—Pralaya—had arrived at its term, the great Being—Para-Atma or Para-Purusha—the Lord existing through himself, out of whom and through whom all things were, and are and will be, resolved to emanate from his own substance the various creatures" (*Manava-Dhama-Sastra*).

When we speak of the Deity and make it identical, hence coeval, with nature, the eternal and uncreate nature is meant, and not your aggregate of flitting shadows and finite unrealities. We leave it to the hymn-makers to call the visible sky or heaven, God's Throne, and our earth of mud His footstool. Our DEITY is neither in a paradise, nor in a particular tree, building, or mountain: it is everywhere, in every atom of the visible as of the invisible Cosmos, in, over, and around every invisible atom and divisible molecule; for IT is the mysterious power of evolution and involution, the omnipresent, omnipotent, and even omniscient potentiality.

Read the superb Kabalistic poem by Solomon Ben Jehudah Gabirol, in the Kether-Malchut, and you will understand: "Thou art one, the

---

NOTE.—Collated from the works of H. P. Blavatsky.

root of all numbers, but not as an element of numeration; for unity admits not of multiplication, change, or form. Thou art one, and in the secret of Thy unity the wisest of men are lost, because they know it not. Thou art one, and Thy unity is never diminished, never extended, and cannot be changed. Thou art one, and no thought of mine can fix for Thee a limit, or define Thee. Thou ART, but not as one existent, for the understanding and vision of mortals cannot attain to Thy existence, nor determine for Thee the where, the how and the why," etc., etc. In short, our Deity is the eternal, incessantly *evolving,* not *creating,* builder of the universe; that *universe itself unfolding* out of its own essence, not being *made.* It is a sphere, without circumference, in its symbolism, which has but one ever-acting attribute embracing all other existing or thinkable attributes—ITSELF. It is the one law, giving the impulse to manifested, eternal, and immutable laws, within that never-manifesting, *because* absolute LAW, which in its manifesting periods is *The ever-Becoming.*

Were we to exclude the Omnipresent Principle from one single mathematical point of the universe, or from a particle of matter occupying any conceivable space, could we still regard it as infinite?

He who has studied the speculations of Pythagoras on the Monad, which, after emanating the Duad, retires into silence and darkness, and thus creates the Triad, can realize whence came the Philosophy of the great Samian Sage, and after him that of Socrates and Plato. The mystic Decad ($1+2+3+4=10$) is a way of expressing this idea. The One is God; the Two, Matter; the Three, combining Monad and Duad and partaking of the nature of both, is the phenomenal World; the Tetrad, or form of perfection, expresses the emptiness of all; and the Decad, or sum of all, involves the entire Kosmos.

In the *Epinomis* is fully stated the doctrine of the Pythagorean numbers in relation to created things. As a true Platonist, its author maintains that wisdom can only be attained by a thorough inquiry into the occult nature of the creation; it alone assures us an existence of bliss after death. The immortality of the soul is greatly speculated upon in this treatise; but its author adds that we can attain to this knowledge only through a complete comprehension of the numbers; for the man, unable to distinguish the straight line from a curved one will never have wisdom enough to secure a mathematical demonstration of the *invisible,* i.e., we must assure ourselves of the objective existence of our soul (astral body) before we learn that we are in possession of a

divine and immortal spirit. Iamblichus says the same thing; adding, moreover, that it is a secret belonging to the highest initiation. The Divine Power, he says, always felt indignant with those "who rendered manifest the composition of the icostagonus," viz., who delivered the method of inscribing in a sphere the dodecahedron.

According to Plato, the Universe is built by "the first begotten" on the geometrical figure of the Dodecahedron. The four-fold Dodecahedron on the model of which the universe is said by Plato to have been built by the manifested Logos, synthesized by the unmanifested First-Born, yields geometrically the key to Cosmogony and its microcosmic reflection—our Earth.

The idea that "numbers" possessing the greatest virtue, produce always what is good and never what is evil, refers to justice, equanimity of temper, and everything that is harmonious. "The numerals of Pythagoras," says Porphyry, "were hieroglyphical symbols, by means whereof he explained *all* ideas concerning the nature of all things."

Pythagoras taught that the entire universe is one vast system of mathematically correct combinations. Plato shows the deity *geometrizing*. The world is sustained by the same law of equilibrium and harmony upon which it was built.

"God geometrizes," said Plato. "The laws of nature are the thoughts of God," exclaimed Oersted, 2,000 years later. "His thoughts are immutable," repeated the solitary student of Hermetic lore, "therefore it is in the perfect harmony and equilibrium of all things that we must seek the truth." And thus, proceeding from the indivisible unity, he found emanating from it two contrary forces, each acting through the other and producing equilibrium, and the three were but one, the Pythagorean Eternal Monad. The primordial point is a circle; the circle squaring itself from the four cardinal points becomes a quaternary, the perfect square, having at each of its four angles a letter of the mirific name, the sacred TETRAGRAM. It is the four Buddhas who came and have passed away; the Pythagorean *tetractys*—absorbed and resolved by the one eternal NO-BEING.

The term "God"—unless referring to the Unknown Deity or Absoluteness, which can hardly be supposed *acting* in any way—has always meant in ancient philosophies the collectivity of the working and intelligent Forces in nature. The word "Forest" is singular, yet it is the term to express the idea of thousands or even millions of trees of different kinds. Materialists have the option of saying "Nature," or

still better—"Law, geometrizes" if they so prefer. But in the days of Plato, the average reader would hardly have understood the metaphysical distinction and real meaning. The truth, however, of Nature ever "geometrizing" is easily ascertained. Here is an instance: Heat is the modification of the motions of particles of matter. Now, it is a physical and mechanical law that particles or bodies in motion of themselves, assume a spheroidal form—this, from a globular planet down to a drop of rain. Observe the snowflakes, which along with crystals exhibit to you all the geometrical forms existing in nature. As soon as motion ceases, the spheroidal shape alters; or, as Tyndall tells us, it becomes a flat drop, then the drop forms an equilateral triangle, a hexagon and so on. In observing the breaking up of ice-particles in a large mass, through which he passed heat rays, he observed that the first shape the particles assumed, was triangular or pyramidal, then cubical and finally hexagonal, etc. Thus even modern physical science, corroborates Plato and justifies his proposition.

The Rosicrucian theory, that the whole universe is a musical instrument, is the Pythagorean doctrine of the music of the spheres. Sounds and colors are all spiritual numerals; as the seven prismatic rays proceed from one spot in heaven, so the seven powers of nature, each of them a number, are the seven radiations of the Unity, the central, spiritual *Sun.*

"Happy is he who comprehends the spiritual numerals, and perceives their mighty influence!" exclaims Plato. And happy, we may add, is he who, treading the maze of force-correlations, does not neglect to trace them to this invisible Sun!

All systems of religious mysticism are based on numerals. With Pythagoras, the Manas or unity, emanating the duad, and thus forming the trinity, and the quaternary or Arba-il (the mystic *four*), compose the number seven. The sacredness of numbers begins with the great First—the *One,* and ends only with the nought or zero—symbol of the infinite and boundless circle which represents the universe. All the intervening figures, in whatever combination, or however multiplied, represent philosophical ideas, from vague outlines to a definitely-established scientific axiom, relating either to a moral or a physical fact in nature. They are a key to the ancient views on cosmogony, in its broad sense, including man and beings, and the evolution of the human race, spiritually as well as physically.

The number *seven* is the most sacred of all, and is, undoubtedly, of Hindu origin. Everything of importance was calculated by and fitted

into this number by the Aryan philosophers—ideas as well as localities.

Now Pythagoras says that "The number eight, or the Octad, is the first cube, that is to say, squared in all senses, as a die, proceeding from its base two, or even number; *so is man four-squared or perfect.*" Of course few, except the Pythagoreans and kabalists, can fully comprehend this idea; but the illustration will assist in pointing out the close kinship of the numerals with the vedic *Mantras.* The chief problems of every theology lie concealed beneath this imagery of fire and the varying rhythm of its flames. The burning bush of the Bible, the Zoroastrian and other sacred fires, Plato's universal soul, and the Rosicrucian doctrines of both soul and body of man being evolved out of fire, the reasoning and immortal element which permeates all things, and which, according to Herakleitus, Hippocrates, and Parmenides, is God, have all the same meaning.

"The figure 8 or 00 indicates the perpetual and regular motion of the Universe," says Ragon. But if perfect as a cosmic number it is likewise the symbol of the lower *Self,* the animal nature of man. Figure 9 represents the earth under the influence of an *evil principle.* Three times three is the great symbol of *corporisation,* or the materialisation of spirit according to Pythagoras—hence of gross matter.

According to Max Muller "the two words 'cipher' and 'zero,' which are in reality but one . . . are sufficient to prove that our figures are borrowed from the Arabs." Cipher is the Arabic "cifron," and means *empty,* a translation of the Sanscrit name of the nought "synya," he says. The Arabs had their figures from Hindustan, and never claimed the discovery for themselves. As to the Pythagoreans, we need but turn to the ancient manuscripts of Boethius' *Geometry,* composed in the sixth century, to find in the Pythagorean numerals the 1 and the *nought,* as the first and final cipher. And Porphyry, who quotes from the Pythagorean *Moderatus,* says that the numerals of Pythagoras were "hieroglyphical symbols, by means whereof he explained ideas concerning the nature of things."

Each metre in the *Brahmanas* corresponds to a number, and as shown by Haug, as it stands in the sacred volumes, is a prototype of some visible form on earth, and its effects are either good or evil.

There are words which have a destructive quality in their very syllables, as though objective things; for every sound awakens a corresponding one in the invisible world of spirit, and the repercussion produces either a good or a bad effect. Harmonious rhythm, a melody vibrating

softly in the atmosphere, creates a beneficent and sweet influence around, and acts most powerfully on the psychological as well as physical natures of every living thing on earth; it reacts even on inanimate objects, for matter is still spirit in its essence, invisible as it may seem to our grosser senses.

So with the numerals. Turn wherever we will, from the Prophets to the Apocalypse, and we will see the biblical writers constantly using the numbers *three, four, seven* and *twelve.*

The use of geometrical figures and the frequent allusion to figures in all ancient scriptures (see Puranas, Egyptian papyri, the "Book of the Dead" and even the Bible) must be explained. In the "Book of Dzyan," as in the Kabala, there are two kinds of numerals to be studied —the figures, often simple blinds, and the Sacred Numbers, the values of which are all known to the Occultists through Initiation. The former is but a conventional glyph, the latter is the basic symbol of all. That is to say, that one is purely physical, the other purely metaphysical, the two standing in relation to each other as matter stands to spirit—the extreme poles of the one Substance.

As Balzac, the unconscious Occultist of French literature, says somewhere, the Number is to Mind the same as it is to matter: "an incomprehensible agent"; (perhaps so to the profane, never to the Initiated mind). Number is, as the great writer thought, an Entity, and, at the same time, a Breath emanating from what he called God and what we call the All; the breath which alone could organize the physical Kosmos, "where naught obtains its form but through the Deity, which is an effect of Number." It is instructive to quote Balzac's words upon this subject: "The smallest as the most immense creations, are they not to be distinguished from each other by their quantities, their qualities, their dimensions, their forces and attributes, all begotten by the Number? The infinitude of the Numbers is a fact proven to our mind, but of which no proof can be physically given. The mathematician will tell us that the infinitude of the numbers exists but is not to be demonstrated. God is a Number endowed with motion, which is felt but not demonstrated. *As Unity, it begins the Numbers, with which it has nothing in common.* . . . The existence of the Number depends on Unity, which, without a single Number, begets them all."

The expression "All is One Number, issued from No Number" relates again to that universal and philosophical tenet. That which is absolute is of course No Number; but in its later significance it has

an application in Space as in Time. It means that not only every increment of time is part of a larger increment, up to the most indefinitely prolonged duration conceivable by the human intellect, but also that no manifested thing can be thought of except as part of a larger whole: the total aggregate being the One manifested Universe that issues from the unmanifested or Absolute—called Non-Being or "No-Number," to distinguish it from Being or "the One Number."

From the effulgency of light—the ray of the ever-darkness—sprung in space the re-awakened energies; the one from the egg, the six, and the five. Then the three, the one, the four, the one, the five—the twice seven the sum total. And these are the essences, the flames, the elements, the builders, the numbers, the arupa, the rupa, and the force of Divine Man—the sum total.

This relates to the sacred Science of Numerals: so sacred, indeed, and so important in the study of Occultism that the subject can hardly be skimmed. It is on the Hierarchies and correct numbers of these Beings invisible (to us) except upon very rare occasions, that the mystery of the whole Universe is built.

"The Three, the One, the Four, the One, the Five" (in their totality —twice seven) represent 31415—the numerical hierarchy. Mathematically they represent the well-known calculation, namely, that the ratio of the diameter to the circumference of a circle is as 1 to 3.1415, or the value of pi, as this ratio is called—the symbol pi being always used in mathematical formulae to express it. This set of figures must have the same meaning, since the 1 : 314,159, and then again 1 : 3 : 1,415,927 are worked out in the secret calculations to express the various cycles and ages of the "first born," or 311,040,000,000,000 with fractions.

Thus, while in the metaphysical world, the circle with the one central Point in it has no number, and is called Anupadaka (parentless and numberless)—viz., it can fall under no calculation—in the manifested world the mundane Egg or Circle is circumscribed within the groups called the Line, the Triangle, the Pentacle, the second Line and the Cube (or 13514); and when the Point having generated a Line, thus becomes a diameter which stands for the androgynous Logos, then the figures become 31415, or a triangle, a line, a cube, the second line, and a pentacle.

Three, five and seven are mystical numbers, and the last and the first are as greatly honoured by Masons as by the Parsis—the triangle being a symbol of Deity everywhere.

The circle was with every nation the symbol of the Unknown—"Boundless Space," the abstract garb of an ever present abstraction—the Incognisable Deity. It represents limitless Time in Eternity. The Zeroana Akerne is also the "Boundless Circle of the Unknown Time," from which Circle issues the radiant light—the Universal Sun, or Ormazd—and the latter is identical with Kronos, in his Æolian form, that of a Circle. For the circle is Sar, and Saros, or cycle, and was the Babylonian god whose circular horizon was the visible symbol of the invisible, while the sun was the ONE Circle from which proceeded the Cosmic orbs, and of which he was considered the leader. Zero-ana, is the Chackra or circle of Vishnu, the mysterious emblem which is, according to the definition of a mystic, "a curve of such a nature that as to any, the least possible part thereof, if the curve be protracted either way it will proceed and finally re-enter upon itself, and form one and the same curve—or that which we call the circle." No better definition could thus be given of the natural symbol and the evident nature of Deity, which having its circumference everywhere (the boundless) has, therefore, its central point also everywhere; in other words, is in every point of the Universe.

The Seven was a Sacred Number with every nation; but none applied it to more physiologically materialistic uses than the Hebrews. Whereas with the Hindus and Aryans generally, the significance was manifold, and related almost entirely to purely metaphysical and astronomical truths. Their Rishis and gods, their Demons and Heroes, have historical and ethical meanings, and the Aryans never made their religion rest solely on physiological symbols, as the old Hebrews have done.

The seven *Laya* centers are the seven Zero points, using the term Zero in the same sense that Chemists do, to indicate a point at which, in Esotericism, the scale of reckoning of differentiation begins. From the Centres—beyond which Esoteric philosophy allows us to perceive the dim metaphysical outlines of the "Seven Sons" of Life and Light, the Seven Logoi of the Hermetic and all other philosophers—begins the differentiation of the elements which enter into the constitution of our Solar System.

The earliest forms of elementary geometry must have certainly been suggested by the observation of the heavenly bodies and their groupings. Hence the most archaic symbols in Eastern Esotericism are a point, a triangle, a plane, a cube, a pentacle, and a hexagon, and plane

figures with various sides and angles. This shows the knowledge and use of geometrical symbology to be as old as the world.

Starting from this, it becomes easy to understand how nature herself could have taught primeval mankind, even without the help of its divine instructors, the first principles of a numerical and geometrical symbol language. Hence one finds numbers and figures used as an expression and a record of thought in every archaic symbolical Scripture. They are ever the same, with only certain variations growing out of the first figures. Thus the evolution and correlation of the mysteries of Kosmos, of its growth and development—spiritual and physical, abstract and concrete—were first recorded in geometrical changes of shape. Every Cosmogony began with a circle, a point, a triangle, and a cube, up to number 9, when it was synthesized by the first line and a circle—the Pythagorean mystic *Decad,* the sum of all, involving and expressing the mysteries of the entire Kosmos; recorded a hundred times more fully in the Hindu system, for him who can understand its mystic language. The numbers 3 and 4, in their blending of 7, as those of 5, 6, 9, and 10, are the very corner-stone of Occult Cosmogonies. This decad and its thousand combinations are found in every portion of the globe. One recognizes them in the caves and rock-cut temples of Hindostan and Central Asia, as in the pyramids and lithoi of Egypt and America; in the Catacombs of Ozimandyas, in the mounds of the Caucasian snow-capped fastnesses, in the ruins of Palenque, in Easter Island, everywhere whither the foot of ancient man has ever journeyed.

(To be continued.)

Permanent Benefits

As a gift is one thing, the act of giving another, as a sailor is one thing, the act of sailing another, and, as a sick man and his disease are not the same thing although a sick man is not without disease, so a benefit is one thing, and that which anyone receives by means of the benefit another. The benefit is incorporeal, and is never rendered invalid. Blessings that we have received can cease to be ours, but they can never cease from having been ours; what has been, too, is part of a benefit, and, indeed, its surest part. No power can efface the fact that this man has given, and that one received.

—Seneca

YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK—AND ANSWER

THE popularity of psychoanalysis today has brought to the attention of the ordinary person many underlying causes for his "complexes," of which we all seem to have a few, often originating in childhood. It is possible, however, for a person to be somewhat aware of the factors that led to his maladjustment, and want to understand them better, yet feel that it would be absolutely wrong for him to go through the analytic treatment. The process of analysis, so far as this student can determine, enables one to bring out into the open and face those things which he had covered up and falsely compensated for. There are bound to be many things one will miss seeing if relying entirely on "self-help," and the process appears to be a very much slower one than that of psychoanalysis. It seems a little inadequate to say "let him do the best he can with what he has." In other words, one's feelings or intuition may argue against resorting to analysis, whereas logic favors the step.

(*a*) Before we discuss this, we need to note that this question concerns only the people who are themselves willing and able to see a psychoanalyst—not those who are so disturbed that they don't realize that they need help. Psychiatry would classify the latter type as psychotic. We could say, then, that we are discussing a slightly neurotic person, or even any ordinary person.

The question here is: At what point is psychoanalysis really necessary? How can we tell when we should resort to analysis, so that it does not present merely an escape? Psychoanalysis is necessary only when a person is mentally and emotionally so handicapped that he is not able to live with his fellow beings, and so can't handle any kind of situation adequately.

If the popularity of psychoanalysis today has brought to the attention of the ordinary person many underlying causes for his "complexes" —of which we all definitely have a few—it would appear that everybody should run to a psychoanalyst. From a practical point of view, this is of course impossible. The way it is now, we haven't nearly enough psychoanalysts for the people who are in most need of help. Even if this shortage did not exist, we would still need to remember that all wise men have taught self-reliance. Psychiatry and psycho-

analysis, actually, also have this basic concept; but those who run to analysts often do not.

It may be true that if a person goes through analysis he knows more about himself than he did before. Still it is up to *him* to do the best he can with what he has. Even though he knows more than he did before, it will take much time to change.

We can understand how "logic" may seem to favor psychoanalysis as a "short-cut" to maturity and adult thinking. But isn't this an escape? If we really want to grow, and make a big enough effort to do so, we can do it with philosophy and patience.

If all of our imbalances were to come up at once, this probably would be too much for us to take, and we would lose our balance. That is why we have the law of Karma and Reincarnation. Karma, in this sense, takes care of every situation so we can learn from it *gradually,* but thoroughly. Reincarnation, we could say, gives us enough time to keep on learning and learning.

(*b*) All processes of evolution are an individual matter, depending upon the stage of the evolving ego, so that a question of this sort, too, would be an individual matter. It has been shown through endless accounts of case-histories that psychoanalysis does have a part to play in helping mankind. Yet anything, overdone, becomes destructive. There are those who are virtually unable to help themselves, being so wound up in their own distorted world that they cannot relate properly to the world around them, and even more important, to their own inner, true world. These people do need some kind of help—"outside" help —to enable them to become perceptive again and to face reality. But the person who can relate to things and ideas in what is called a normal adult manner should be able to see faults and distortions in his own nature, and thus help himself. There is a point, it would seem, varying with each "patient," when he is required to assert discretion, to try to draw on his own "high authority." Otherwise it is easy to lapse into thinking that we are not really able to take on our own responsibilities. For that is what is done, in effect, when we seek the help, in whatever degree, of another person or of a system other than our own. It is necessary for a person to at least feel that he is ultimately, that is *potentially,* capable of relying on his own higher nature. In theosophical study the aim is to bring the *true nature* into light so that one will lean only on *it,* or, more correctly, act according to it.

Once we realize that learning how to live is not going to be an easy,

down-hill, well-trodden path, then it hits us that it is absolutely necessary to start exercising our own discretion, however inadequate it may be at first, rather than to think of ourselves as children, unable to make adult choices. But there is a subtle line here, for we also know that we are often unable to live as competent adults able to make the right choices. Yet we can bring forth the most independent thought and motivation we are capable of, if we bear in mind that we are very *much* dependent, in one sense, on every one and on some system of thought. After this realization of humility, we can utilize more adequately all thoughts proffered by systems and other people, because we will be seeking only that which is necessary for *us* at our own particular stage of evolution, and not merely "accepting" a system. Everything that is uncovered about the nature and complexities of man is important and worthy of examination and interest.

(*c*) It is stated in the doctrines of Theosophy that the more completely *manas* becomes incarnated, the more of complexity is exposed. We observe, psychologically, innumerable conflicting pulls, tendencies, distortions, emotions, moral convictions, and so forth—combinations which must be dealt with in an individual manner. So to have the specific theories of Freudian psychoanalysis, as a routine answer for all people who find themselves troubled or maladjusted to society is like the mass rush to the drug store to buy the latest drug to cure all ills.

Yet, on the other hand, it should not be overlooked that psychiatry is about the only generally accepted school of theory which accepts individual man *as he is.* Religion does not do this, and philosophies are often too abstract, but psychiatry "accepts." This may be thought to fit nicely with a very important part of theosophic teaching—that any man can now be "accepted" precisely because he is in essence a far greater being than he yet knows. Psychiatry, like education, starts with understanding, not with judging. Therefore, how is one to say just when and where it is necessary to take "advantage" of educational help and when one should depend only on himself? Ultimately, we know that complete self-reliance is necessary, but still we should not form rigid conclusions about those who are in need of help—perhaps also not fortunate enough to be exposed to theosophic teachings, or to be able to assimilate them. Further, unless we are willing to accept the validity of therapeutic treatment in many cases, we may miss understanding some of the psychological steps of man's evolutionary journey. We are all, perhaps, "case histories" to some degree.

SEEDS AND SEEDLINGS

Discarded Links

[The short articles comprising this series are derivations from characteristic platform talks given during the years 1915-35. As often as was practicable, the words of the speaker have been used—hoping thus to convey some of the force originally imparted to the ideas.]

ONE of two views of life govern all of us, more or less unconsciously to ourselves. One of these is the religious view; the other is what we may call the materialistic, or scientific. Most people either do not consider these two contrasting terms at all, or, if they do, make no real effort to find out what portion of our nature they relate to. Both are to some extent right; both, in some respects, wrong. The trouble lies in mistaking a part for the whole, in confusing partial truth with the whole truth. Over and over again, we have had a direct perception of pure truth; and so powerful is the nature of straight or direct perception that it instantly affects us so deeply that we mistake our *glimpse* of the eternal verities for a full and rounded view.

The scientist knows that man is no special creation. He knows that nothing in nature is a special creation; that whatever exists in nature has come about under law, as the sequence of a long-continued concatenation of causes and effects. So that anything that now is, stands at the summit of a long and silent evolution which preceded it. Scientists know that; *we* know that. There is no possibility of a man's failing to gain that absolute knowledge—that *whatever* we cognize is preceded by an everlasting procession of sowing and reaping, by repeated cycles of creation, preservation, and destruction, by recreation and redestruction, until finally whatever we have represents the capstone of a structure, whether finished or unfinished.

Yet just as the scientist may be said to have a knowledge that the religionist has not, so the religious man has a knowledge that the scientist has not. The religionist has jumped a gap, but does not know *how* he jumped it. The religionist knows that behind everything that is, whether its birth or its life or its death, its good or evil experiences, there is Intelligence of some kind. Yet, not knowing what that Intelli-

gence is, nor seeing any relation between his own limited area of perception and the Intelligence which he sees behind all things, the religionist tries to formulate that unknown Intelligence in terms of his known intelligence. He tries to describe the flawless power behind all the operations of nature, however imperfect those operations may be, by formulating the nature of that perfection in terms of his own imperfections.

What is the matter with science? A missing link. What is the matter with religion? A missing link. That is all. It is just here that the Theosophist steps in to provide the missing link. For in a very practical sense (although we may not like the word), Theosophy and the men who speak of Theosophical teachings are scavengers, or gleaners. As scavengers, they clean up what religionists and scientists have tossed away as trash; as gleaners, they sort out the worth-while bits, and with them build a "bridge" between religion and science.

All of us have a religious side to our nature, whether we are Christians or non-Christians, scientists or materialists. We have found that both good and evil experiences are encountered by every man, and these good and evil experiences are not to be classified in terms of matter. Whatever they are, they are immaterial. Nor are they to be classified in terms of forces; nor in terms of correlations of forces and forms. They are to be classified in terms of *consciousness*. You can take a stone, pick it up and pitch it across the room, or throw it out of a high window, or toss it in the fire, or bury it in the ground, or drop it to the bottom of the sea—it doesn't bother the stone one bit. But pick one of us up and pitch him across the room (same act), or throw him out of the window (same act), drop him to the bottom of the sea (same act), or put him in the fire (same act), and the *man* will suffer, as we say, "the tortures of the damned." Yet all this happened in the same space, with the same kind of matter, with the same forces, and in the same correlation. The difference is not in any of these things; the difference is in *consciousness*. All this indicates that the scientist's missing link is the nonrecognition of consciousness as one of the incessantly present factors in all things. The religionist intuitively recognizes the presence of consciousness. It is the conviction, or recognition, of something in him besides matter and force and their correlations—the perception which he calls "good and evil"—that makes a man religious by nature. Being religious by nature, he takes that form of religion into which he is born, as he takes the physical form into which he is born.

Once a man sees that religion is one of the keys to nature and to man, no matter what religion it is, and that science has the key to one of the departments of nature and of man, and that the religious key fits one part of our nature, but won't work in the other, and that by using both keys he is *still* confronted with mystery, he is confused. There remains a mystery that is yet to be clarified.

Scientists do not understand that both force and matter are intelligence. True, it is not the same kind of intelligence as ours, but in its own way it vastly surpasses our intelligence. When our scientists recognize that what they call "forces" are *intelligent beings,* so fine, so different in their nature and character that their mere contact with matter moves matter, and that these beings can be appealed to in their intelligence, science will have become religious. And when our religionists, in the course of time, begin to realize that Christ had no patent on divinity, that any man may know what Christ knew, that any man may enjoy the communion with the Father that Christ enjoyed, that any man may express the compassion that Christ expressed—in short, that the same source of strength and knowledge that Christ drew from is in *each man*—when that happens, religion will have become scientific.

The scientist disregards one important thing: responsibility to man and nature. There is no sense of responsibility in science, nor ever has been. We are here reminded of the story of the Scotch Laird who, when he was dying called his son to him and said: "My son, get money. Get it honestly if you can, but *get money.*" So it is with the whole attitude of modern science: get knowledge; get it honestly if you can, but *get* knowledge. But of what avail? All these forces that science has learned to handle are used for evil more frequently than they are for good! That is due to the irresponsibility of modern science.

The religionist, on the other hand, although he has grasped the idea that there is an Intelligence beyond ours, cannot get away from the idea that such knowledge as is superior to ours, is *another* existence. So although he teaches man's responsibility, he does so in precisely the same terms as a slave-owner teaches it to his slaves. To a religious mind, responsibility means "obedience to the Will of God."

It is here that the Theosophist, the scavenger, again steps in. You threw away, he says, the fact that every being *is*—not "was" nor "will be," but *is—eternally* the One Element. You failed to notice, and therefore tossed away the fact, that whether we speak of matter or force, or mind or soul or spirit, we are speaking all the time of one and the

same element in one of two conditions; a condition of knowledge or a condition of ignorance. The trouble with man is that he accepts ignorance. The trouble with man is that he does not *see the identity* between the creative power *in him* and the creative power that he names God; that he does not see the identity of the perceiving power in himself with that all-seeing Eye he calls God; that he does not perceive that the intelligence within him is identical with the Supreme Spirit or Supreme Intelligence.

When a man sees, not God as one thing and himself as another, but each as One Element, One Self, One Spirit, then the man begins to strive for knowledge. As he attains knowledge, that in him which is heterogeneous becomes homogeneous; that in him which is at war with the rest of nature becomes at peace with the rest of nature. And when that occurs, even though the man becomes no different in external appearance, "he" has changed beyond recognition: wisdom has replaced ignorance, purity has replaced impurity, selflessness has replaced selfishness. *That* man has evolved through faith (Religion) and law (Science) and knowledge (Theosophy) until he has "created" the Man of Spirit within the man of matter. Thus have creation, evolution, destruction, and recreation come full circle.

Two Halves, not a Whole

Belief in the reality of values and in man's ability to recognize or to establish them is a *sine qua non* for any world which is to remain what has previously been thought of as human. It is not, however, all that is necessary for the management of such a world. Five thousand years of history demonstrate how far noble ideas, exalted faiths, and stern codes of morality are from actually guaranteeing wise, just, or even decent conduct. Obviously, these ideals and codes are not enough. But it is no less true that it is because of what some men have professed, and to some extent been influenced by, that human history is not "nothing but" crimes and follies.

Past history shows that beliefs and professions are not all that is necessary. It shows also that the other necessary things include more than that sincerity and consistency. These "other things necessary" include intelligence and knowledge, and knowledge includes much of what we know about science. —JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

ON THE LOOKOUT

Reincarnation Novels

Even without impetus of "Bridey Murphy's" purported psychic journey to the scenes of another lifetime, a few enthusiasts of amateur literary standing are forever publishing small volumes of reincarnation romance. A number of these are submitted to Lookout for comment, but seldom merit recommendation. In fact, it often seems that a direct plunging into the reincarnation theme inhibits whatever natural talent the author may have for story-telling, so involved does the narrative become with establishing a continuity of emotional experience between one life and another. Excessive sentimentalism is also often apparent, since the usual procedure is to have a love story unfold through six or seven incarnations, the hero or heroine being always reborn to a similar relationship with parents and lovers. Often, the publisher's brief description of the content of such books comes closer to awakening interest in reincarnation-theory than the story itself.

"The Ring of Ages"

Typical volume of such books is *The Ring of Ages,* by Sophie Klimbach. The jacket blurb properly calls attention to the fact that the perspective of reincarnation alone "offers the well-integrated panorama of life":

> It pits real people against the responsibilities they themselves must shoulder. And the implication that these responsibilities can be traced back into the dim past of other lives, and that fate is the severe taskmaster who cannot be denied, is the touchstone.

The one theme in this volume which justifies this generalization is that which brings the heroine, again and again, to the brink of the same essential decision she faced in another life and could not resolve. It is doubtful, however, whether this book will impress any save those who make of reincarnation a romance rather than impersonal evidence of the law of Periodicity.

"Yankee Viking—A Saga of Love and Reincarnation"

Under the above title, a novel by Livingston Hartley reveals higher literary calibre; its 1956 issuance by the Roland Neal Press of Beverly Hills, will probably reach a fairly large audience. A foreword by Mr. V. P. Neal contains the following paragraphs:

> What this book says to you will depend upon where you are on the great highroad of human life and development.
>
> It will certainly open the door to new dimensions of thought.
>
> To many it will stand out as a unique love story running like a golden thread through a thousand years of one man's experience.
>
> To others it will be a new point of view on the story of man's struggle for freedom down the centuries and the forces assisting him in his struggle.
>
> To all it will pose the question, is the destiny of the individual forged through many lifetimes of experience and effort?
>
> Whatever the book means to you, one thing is certain, you will never again be quite the same after reading it.

Mr. Hartley is not, as is the case with so many "first novel" producers of reincarnation fiction, an inexperienced author. As a member of the United States Foreign Service, he wrote a book on foreign policy that was published by Prentice-Hall in 1937. Mr. Hartley is a fairly sophisticated historian, and this aspect of the book is intriguing, with the leading character "presented in a moving panorama of events which are not interrupted by death. It begins to seem quite normal that Joe Gardiner should commute between this world and the 'Next Place' and follow a continuous and meaningful career of activity. Working out the effects of the causes he has set in motion he emerges as a free man, free to choose and make his own destiny. When he finally wins the battle between narrow self interest and identification with the larger goals of mankind he finds that the larger goal includes all that he has desired." The effects of causes set in motion in previous lives are encountered, with similar choices being made and consequent failures induced. Finally, "the battle between narrow self-interest and identification" and "the larger goals of mankind" is won.

Yankee Viking, however, in dealing with such a number of incarnations, becomes nearly as confusing as *The Ring of Ages*—the mechanics of rebirth taking the place of essential philosophy and psychology. Also, the reader will note a strange combining of spiritualist teachings since, between lives, the characters of the book wander invisibly around the world, striving to help and influence.

"Double Exposure"

This novel by Theo Fleischman, which has reincarnation as its theme, "without benefit by hypnotism," is reviewed by Edmund Fuller in the New York *Times,* April 29. Mr. Fuller says that "although I neither

believe in reincarnation nor have any particular interest in the subject, Mr. Fleischman's story . . . proved to be quite a notable experience in simple terms of human drama. . . . . It is the inner struggle and development of soul that makes the novel." The reincarnation theme is introduced:

> Strange, obsessive experiences begin to happen to Florentin; he feels inexplicable, even terrifying, stirrings within him. An unidentified portrait of the Empire period in an antiquarian's shop becomes a thing he must possess. The acquiring of it drives him to acts of appalling temerity.
>
> From his unconscious arises the name, General Baron Taillard. Florentin looks him up, finding him to have been one of Napoleon's commanders. Seeking some enlightenment, he screws up the courage to obtain an interview with the historian Menétrier, who knows more of Taillard than anyone else; in this conversation he finds a voice that *seems* unlike his own challenging and correcting the historian on details of battles.

Nevil Shute—Master Story Teller

Nevil Shute's *In The Wet,* latest novel from the pen of this prolific and much-loved writer, returns to the reincarnation theme of an earlier book, *An Old Captivity.* Here the deviation from theosophic tenets consists in dramatizing an *immediate* rebirth. The concept of reincarnation is not, however, continually thrust into the forefront; it is not until the last page of *In The Wet* is finished that the reader is sure that the pre-visioned reincarnation has already taken place. This subtlety of treatment gives to this book a lasting and impressive quality not found in the other fictional works mentioned. There are no "passages on reincarnation" beyond the following, where an old man dies from one life only to be soon reborn in another:

> "You'll be all right," I said quietly. "God is very merciful, and he won't judge you too hard."
>
> "You don't know nothing," the old man muttered weakly. "I could tell you things. Old Liang here, he's got the rights of it. I ain't done so good. I know it. I'll start lower down next time. But I'll be right. Everyone gets another shot, however low you go, and I'll be right."
>
> He seemed to be convinced about reincarnation in some form, and he was too weak for me to argue with him. I was weak myself; the hot fit had come on me again, and I was restless and sweating.
>
> "You'll be right," I said. "God will look after you."
>
> "I ain't afraid of dying," Stevie muttered at last. "That's nothing. Old Liang here, he knows a thing or two. It's just going off to sleep

and sliding off into the next time. I reckon that I'd rather be there than here."

One sometimes wonders if the notion of an immediate rebirth is such a bad introduction, after all, to the philosophy of reincarnation. With the suggestion that such quick returns are sometimes possible in the cases of accidental death, the implication is not altogether false, and such treatment as that given by Nevil Shute withdraws attention from useless speculation about "other world" existence between lives.

AN ENGLISH NOVELIST'S REINCARNATION-ROMANCE

Come Like Shadows, by D. L. Murray (Hodder and Stoughton, London), is another contribution to the growing list of books with reincarnation as a central theme. Mr. Murray served for many years as dramatic critic of the *Nation and Athenaeum,* and has been on the staff of the London *Times.* The apparent personal acceptance of reincarnation theory by this writer will probably leave some mark in literary circles.

Here again, however, we must note a novelist's inability to forego the opportunity to deal with the supposed reincarnation of famous personages. The lovers of *Come Like Shadows,* in their previous existences, had been united in the Court of France just before the downfall of the monarchy—and the heroine is no less a person than Marie Antoinette! St. Germain becomes counsellor to the leading male character, and something of an occult teacher; all the leading figures of France's revolutionary days manage to reincarnate conveniently in twentieth-century London in order to make further chapters in the drama. Mr. Murray is obviously intrigued with hypnosis; and the "occultist" who assists our hero, in his present life, to regain memories of the past, employs this means.

"DIFFERENT FLESHLY MASKS"

The following conversation between the "occultist" and the leading character, however, illustrates Mr. Murray's serious interest. The clairvoyant, "Mr. Harwell," asks why reincarnation cannot be accepted like any other fact of experience. The hero, Meredith, exclaims:

> "What? Believe not only that I have lived in another body before this, which is staggering enough, but that I have come to life again in this century surrounded by those I knew in that past incarnation? Or haven't I made it plain enough in our talks during this week-end that the most peculiar thing about this fantasy is the appearance in it

of people who surround me now, unchanged or only slightly changed? Are you telling me that we have all returned to earth together?"

"But isn't that exactly what it would be reasonable to expect? Those who have incurred mutual debts of love and hatred in one life return to pay off their obligations in another. We call it *karma.*"

"And they are reborn with a physical resemblance also to their former selves?"

"It is the same Self or Ego actually, wearing different fleshly masks. These masks *may* have a common likeness, as is, after all, only natural when you consider how closely soul and body affect each other: but there is no fixed rule about it. Generally speaking, it would seem as if advanced Egos—advanced in good or evil—repeat many of their facial and bodily characteristics in successive incarnations. The more primitive and fluid Egos, who have not yet made their characters very firmly, tend to inhabit differing types of body."

Guy, who had been pacing up and down the room, stopped suddenly and asked, "Am I to believe that *you* are—"

"Saint-Germain?" Mr. Harwell shook his head smiling. "Definitely not. He was an Adept of a rank I am far from having attained. You mustn't be so carried away by the new light, Mr. Meredith, as to suppose that everybody you meet in this existence is an Ego you have known before. You make fresh encounters in each life, as well as renewing old links. You work off the debts you have made in the past, and at the same time create new ones to be paid in the future. That's the rhythm of it."

Food for Thought

An item in *Die Tat,* May 19, reports an "event" which may offer even greater inducement for speculation within the framework of theosophic thought than the suggestions offered as explanation for "Bridey Murphy."

Two women in Genoa were simultaneously struck by a bolt of lightning. The one, Ninetta Buzzi, was in her own apartment when struck unconscious, and was later discovered by her sister and sent to a hospital. The other, Cigora Mucceno, was leaving Genoa for her home in Naples after having visited her brother. Carrying her suitcase, she entered a doorway for shelter from the storm, and was there hit by lightning. She was taken to a different hospital from the one Ninetta Buzzi was in, and there identified by her brother. The account goes:

When Ninetta Buzzi regained consciousness, her physician said: "That was a terrible shock; your heart almost gave out, Mrs. Buzzi."

"Pardon," she said, "there must be a mistake. I am Cigora Mucceno from Naples. I have been visiting my brother in Genoa, and was struck by lightning on my way to the station to return home."

> Ninetta Buzzi would assure everybody over and over again that she was not Ninetta, but was Cigora. Even when confronted by her sister, there was no recognition; she seemed an absolute stranger.

INTERCHANGE OF "I"

Meantime the same drama was being enacted at the other hospital. Both Cigora Mucceno and her suitcase had been identified by her brother, yet when she regained consciousness, she insisted that she was Ninetta Buzzi from Genoa, and that she had a sister living there; also, she was unable to identify her suitcase, declaring that she had never seen it before. The doctors decided that the patient had received a brain injury, so, over her insistent protestations that she was Ninetta Buzzi, they had her taken to a sanitarium. There the superintendent of the institution, Prof. Armeno Sibello, learned about the two women who each insisted that she was the other. After a thorough investigation of all the circumstances, Prof. Sibello concluded:

> A terrifying and, according to all human conception, inexplicable phenomenon has taken place. Up to now nothing like this has ever happened on this earth. I would never have thought this possible, but we are witnessing a perfect case of soul-roaming, or soul-wandering. There it is so clearly before us, yet how strange! These two women have exchanged their "I"—and it will remain for all of us an eternal riddle.

Both women appear as before, yet, Prof. Sibello concludes, since "they think, act, and feel as the other person, it is hardly possible that they will ever relearn their original life or get back their real 'I,' for even the memory of the past has been exchanged."

TENDENCY TO CONFORMITY

The trend toward standardization was noted and sharply criticized by Dr. H. A. M. MacKenzie, president of the University of British Columbia, in his address at the commencement exercises at Stanford University (Los Angeles *Times,* June 18). In the course of the address, Dr. MacKenzie said:

> The tyranny of conformity is the peril of this age. The world we live in is one in which nearly all of the pressures are in the direction of conformity to a mass pattern. Certainly this is not the American ideal.
>
> We tend to read the same books, to reiterate the same secondhand opinions without pausing to question their value. My fear is that all this may result in a complacent mediocrity rather than in stimulating intelligence and leadership.

> Freedom is the right or opportunity or power, to do and say, and write, and think, and be whatever we want to or like. One of the tests of our belief in it is our willingness to allow others to do and say and write things that we dislike, and even hate—and protect them in the exercise of these activities.

Former President Hoover said in an unscheduled address at the same exercises that he had heard a lot of talk about "academic freedom" and that he would like to add a phrase of his own: "Let's stress academic integrity as well as academic freedom."

Infringement of Academic Freedom

One phase of the protest against restriction of academic freedom was reported at length in the New York *Times* for March 22, when a "special committee of the American Association of University Professors called for the censure of five colleges and universities for what it said were violations of academic freedom and tenure." Action on this recommendation was taken at the association's annual meeting in St. Louis, April 6-7, and the following institutions formally censured: University of California, Ohio State University, Rutgers University, Oklahoma University, Temple University, and Jefferson Medical College of Philadelphia.

Consequences of Infringement

An extensive report on professional freedom was prepared by the special committee of AAUP, calling attention to the "alarming consequences that have resulted from the security procedures and the political tensions of the past few years." This report warrants quotation:

> These consequences present serious dangers to the national welfare and to security itself; for our security and welfare are substantially impaired by the recognized insufficiency of the supply of qualified scientists, engineers and foreign service officers and by the human suffering inflicted through unwarranted or crudely conducted investigations and dismissals. Deterred by the unhappy experiences of others, many thoughtful young people now avoid careers in government.
>
> Particularly in a time of stress, this nation cannot afford the deterrents to scholarly careers and the restrictions upon contemporary learning which the events of the past eight years and the prevalent climate of opinion have imposed. The need for intellectual freedom is greater, far greater, than ever before. Technology advances at an unprecedented pace and confers ever more awesome power for welfare or destruction upon humankind.

OBJECTIONS AND DEMANDS OF AAUP

> No rule demanding removal for a specific reason not clearly determinative of professional fitness can validly be implemented by an institution, unless the rule is imposed by law or made necessary by the institution's particular religious coloration. Any rule which bases dismissal upon the mere fact of exercise of Constitutional rights violates the principles of both academic freedom and academic tenure. By eliminating a decision by a faculty member's peers, it may also deny due process. This principle governs the question of dismissal for avowed past or present membership in the Communist party taken by itself.
>
> We cannot accept an educational system that is subject to the irresponsible push and pull of contemporary controversies; and we deem it to be the duty of all elements in the academic community—faculty, trustees, officials, and, as far as possible, students—to stand their ground firmly even while they seek, with patient understanding, to enlarge and deepen popular comprehension of the nature of academic institutions and of society's dependence upon unimpaired intellectual freedom. Measured by this standard, the acts and utterances of a preponderance of college and university administrations in the situations under review leave much to be desired.

STRESSES OF CONFORMITY

As several psychologists have noted, one great danger in the current mania for political conformity is that conformity of action is bound to spread into other areas of behavior, thus increasing emotional strain. Dr. Joseph B. Furst, in *The Neurotic: His Inner and Outer Worlds,* places the blame squarely:

> Neurosis is really a social disease, and while many psychiatrists will admit this in the abstract, they are unwilling or unable to make a specific study of those elements in our society which produce this disease. To make such a study means that the psychiatrist must make an uncompromising and critical examination of capitalism as it affects people today, yet I believe that the psychiatric field as a whole is too wedded and committed to the present system to make such a searching examination.
>
> Statements issued by a committee which is representative of main trends in the American Psychiatric Association [from "The Application of Psychiatry to Industry"], clearly indicate the commitment of psychiatry to the management side of industry. This commitment necessarily results in a definite social orientation which greatly influences the psychiatrists' point of view. The psychiatrists do not make a searching analysis of our society, for this would challenge their allegiance to the status quo.

Dr. Furst notes that the employer not only expects a man to do his job well, but he also expects his employee to be a specific sort of person —one who "fits," who conforms to psychological specifications. The emphasis is on personality, not on individuality.

Dichotomy of Motivation

"The elements which determine all relations in a society are the various forces of production, together with the relations that people enter with one another in the production," says Dr. Furst. He elaborates:

> We Americans are now living within two great systems of interpenetrating but mutually contradictory and conflicting types of relations among ourselves. We participate, sometimes without realizing it, in a huge number of co-operative activities together. At the same time, we must engage very intensively in another set of competitive activities together. These two types of activity are so interlocked that it is frequently not a simple matter of cooperating with some individuals and competing with others, but it often is a matter of competing and cooperating at the same time and with the same people! These conflicting activities are inevitably reflected, within our consciousness, in the shape of conflicting ideas, value judgments, motivations and emotions. They are the true source of the conflicts in "human nature" as we ourselves experience it.

A Forthright Declaration

In a recent YMCA forum on "The Relation of Science and Religion," Dr. Richard P. Feynman, physicist at the California Institute of Technology said (according to the Los Angeles *Times,* June 30) that in his estimation most scientists disbelieve in "their father's God." This God, Dr. Feynman said, is "the kind of a personal God, characteristic of the western religions, to Whom you pray and Who has something to do with creating the universe and guiding you in morals." The difficulty for a student in trying to "weld science and religion" is that "it is imperative in science to doubt," whereas it is just as imperative in religion to believe. This habit of doubt carries over into everything because the student "cannot have it as absolute certainty."

Western Heritage

Dr. Feynman expresses the opinion that "it is not possible for religion to find a set of metaphysical ideas which will be guaranteed not to get into conflicts with the ever-advancing and always-changing sci-

ence; only when they avoid trying to answer the same questions in the same realm can there be an absence of conflict." He continues:

> Western civilization, it seems to me, stands by two heritages. One is the scientific spirit of adventure—the adventure into the unknown, an unknown which must be recognized as unknown in order to be explored; the demand that the unanswerable mysteries of the universe remain unanswered; the attitude that all is uncertain; in short —humility of the intellect.
>
> The other great heritage is Christian ethics—the basis of action on love, the brotherhood of all men, the value of the individual—the humility of the spirit. These two heritages are logically, thoroughly consistent. But logic is not all. One needs one's heart to follow an idea.

A Series of Questions

Dr. Feynman changed his basic question from "Is there a God?" to, "How sure is it that there is a God?"" and asks:

> If people are going back to religion, what are they going back to? Is the modern church a place to give comfort and encouragement to the value of such doubts? So far, have we not drawn strength and comfort to maintain the one or the other of these consistent heritages in a way which attacks the values of the other? Is this unavoidable? How can we draw inspiration to support these two pillars of western civilization so that they may stand together in full vigor, mutually unafraid? Is this not the central problem of our time?

From the Theosophical point of view, certainly, religion is a "pillar" resting upon shifting sand—unless, at its psychological core, it encourages self-reliance. The spirit of science, spoken of by Dr. Feynman as willingness to "adventure into the unknown," must incarnate in religion, and when this occurs, the Theosophic tradition is born again.

Theosophical Concept of "God"

However, whereas Dr. Feynman neatly avoids answering the question "Is there a God?" by rephrasing it, H.P.B. answers the same question bluntly in Section V of the *Key*: "In the God of the Christians, the Father of Jesus, and the Creator—the Biblical God of Moses, in short—we do not believe. We reject the idea of a personal, or an extra-cosmic God, who is but the gigantic shadow of *man,* and not of man at his best, either. . . . We call our 'Father in heaven' that deific essence of which we are cognizant within us, in our heart and spiritual consciousness. Let no man anthropomorphise that essence in us."

ULT LIBRARY
BANGALORE.
Accn. No. 1636